

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

DOUGLAS WOOD and SANDRA
KARLSVIK, husband and wife,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KITSAP COUNTY; WEST SOUND
NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT TEAM;
OFFICER MATTHEW DOUGIL (WestNet);
GIG HARBOR POLICE DEPARTMENT
DETECTIVE JOHN DOE SCHUSTER
(WestNet); DETECTIVE JOHN HALSTED
(POULSBO POLICE DEPT. West NET,
Badge #606); DETECTIVE G.R. MARS
(WSP STATEWIDE INCIDENT
RESPONSE TEAM, Badge #685);
DETECTIVE JOHN DOE WILSON and
JOHN DOES 1-25,

Defendants.

Case No. C05-5575RBL

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

THIS MATTER comes on before the above-entitled Court upon Defendants Schuster, Halstead, and Dougil's Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #42] and upon the Washington State Patrol Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #50].

Having considered the entirety of the records and file herein, the Court rules as follows:

1 The defendants have filed summary judgment motions which are noted for Friday, December 15, 2006.¹
2 Under Local Rule CR 7(b)(2) any opposition to the motions was due on December 11, 2006. Plaintiffs have
3 failed to file any brief in opposition to the motions, and under the Local Rule this Court may consider the
4 failure to file briefs in opposition to the motions as an admission that the motions have merit. Therefore,
5 plaintiffs shall show cause in writing why these motions should not be granted and file opposition briefs as
6 required by Local Rule 7(b)(2) on or before December 29, 2006. **The failure to file a response to this Order**
7 **to Show Cause and any opposition briefs to the motions by December 29, 2006 will result in the**
8 **granting of defendants' motions.** Defendants' motions [Dkt. #'s 42 and 50] will be re-noted for January 5,
9 2006.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 The Clerk shall send uncertified copies of this order to all counsel of record, and to any party appearing
12 pro se.

13 Dated this 15th day of December, 2006.

14 
15 RONALD B. LEIGHTON
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹Defendants Schuster, Halstead, and Dougil originally filed their motion on November 2, 2006 and noted it for November
28 24, 2006. They subsequently re-noted the motion for December 15, 2006 [Dkt. #49]. The WSP defendants originally filed their
motion on November 16, 2006 and noted it for December 8, 2006. The WSP defendants subsequently re-noted the motion for
December 15, 2006 [Dkt. #55]. Thus, plaintiffs have had more than the usual time to file any opposition to the motions.